UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,042	07/23/2001	Takumi Okaue	SONYJP 3.0-190	3744

530   7590   10/05/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER
POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/911,042	OKAUE, TAKUMI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2006*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7/10/2006, with respect to the
rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-24 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore,
the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new
ground(s) of rejection is made with Kamibayashi (U.S. Patent 7,065,648) in view of
Dondeti (U.S. Patent 6,240,188) and/or Harada (U.S. Patent 6,850,914); and Ueda
(U.S. Patent 6,289,102) in view of Ansell (U.S. Patent 6,367,019), Dondeti, and/or
Harada.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12-14, 20, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Kamibayashi (U.S. Patent 7,065,648).

Regarding Claim 1,

Kamibayashi discloses a data processing apparatus for

reproducing data from a memory device or for recording data into a

memory device, the recording or reproducing ordinarily being carried out

on condition that mutual authentication between the data processing

apparatus and the memory device is successful, the data processing

apparatus comprising:

A virtual memory device (Column 12, line 22 to Column 13, line 16);

A structure operable to execute the mutual authentication with the

virtual memory device when the memory device does not include a

structure operable to execute the mutual authentication (Column 12, line

22 to Column 13, line 16); and

A structure operable to reproduce data from the memory device or

record data into the memory device when the mutual authentication with

the virtual memory device is successful (Column 12, line 22 to Column 13,

line 16).

Regarding Claim 8,

Claim 8 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 12,

Claim 12 is a computer readable medium claim that is broader than

apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 24,

Claim 24 is a computer readable medium claim that is broader than

apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Kamibayashi discloses a structure operable to first execute the

mutual authentication with the memory device by initially checking whether

the memory device includes the structure operable to execute the mutual

authentication (Figure 9; and Column 12, lines 38-39).

Regarding Claim 9,

Claim 9 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 2

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 21,

Claim 21 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 2

and is rejected for the same reasons.

3.   Claims 1, 8, 12, 13, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ueda (U.S. Patent 6,289,102).

Regarding Claim 1,

Ueda discloses a data processing apparatus for reproducing data

from a memory device or for recording data into a memory device, the

recording or reproducing ordinarily being carried out on condition that

mutual authentication between the data processing apparatus and the

memory device is successful, the data processing apparatus comprising:

A virtual memory device (Figures 14-16; Column 23, lines 26-61;

and Column 37, lines 5-40);

A structure operable to execute the mutual authentication with the

virtual memory device when the memory device does not include a

structure operable to execute the mutual authentication (Figures 14-16;

Column 23, lines 26-61; and Column 37, lines 5-40); and

A structure operable to reproduce data from the memory device or

record data into the memory device when the mutual authentication with

the virtual memory device is successful (Figures 14-16; Column 23, line

49 to Column 24, line 17; and Column 25, lines 1-16).

Regarding Claim 8,

Claim 8 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 12,

> Claim 12 is a computer readable medium claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

> Claim 13 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 20,

> Claim 20 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 24,

> Claim 24 is a computer readable medium claim that is broader than apparatus claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 3, 5-7, 10, 15, 17-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamibayashi in view of Dondeti (U.S. Patent 6,240,188).

Regarding Claim 3,

Kamibayeshi discloses that the mutual authentication between the structure of the data processing apparatus and the virtual memory device is executed by applying a distributed key and another authenticating key previously stored in the virtual memory device (Column 12, line 22 to Column 13, line 16); but does not disclose authenticating distribution of an enabling key block, the key having been previously enciphered by the enabling key block, the enabling key block containing enciphering data for enciphering renewal keys which are located on various paths of a hierarchical key tree structure, the hierarchical tree structure having a plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, whereby a given one of the plurality of paths of the key structure extends from a specific one of the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, the leaves of the tree structure being respectively associated with a plurality of data processing apparatuses, the enciphering data including upper-rank keys in the tree hierarchy which are enciphered by lower-rank keys.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key for authenticating distribution of an enabling key block, the key having been previously enciphered by the enabling key block, the enabling key block containing enciphering data for enciphering renewal keys which are located on various paths of a hierarchical key tree structure, the hierarchical tree structure having a plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes

of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, whereby a given one

of the plurality of paths of the key structure extends from a specific one of

the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, the

leaves of the tree structure being respectively associated with a plurality of

data processing apparatuses, the enciphering data including upper-rank

keys in the tree hierarchy which are enciphered by lower-rank keys

(Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

incorporate the hierarchical key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording

and reproducing apparatus of Kamibayashi in order to make the system

scalable to allow for the addition and modification of many processing

apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 10,

Claim 10 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 3

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 3

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Kamibayashi as modified by Dondeti discloses the apparatus of

claim 3, in addition, Dondeti discloses means for subjecting the enabling

key block distribution authenticating key to a version controlling process

by a process for renewing individual versions (Column 1, lines 30-46; and

Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21).

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Kamibayashi does not disclose a key tree structure comprising a

plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes

of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a

plurality of paths whereby a given one of the paths extends from a specific

one of the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure,

a plurality of data processing apparatuses being respectively associated

with the leaves of the tree, means for enciphering leaf-keys associated

with the leaves using a storage key that is proper to an individual one of

the data processing apparatuses and then storing the enciphered leaf-key

in a memory means within the corresponding data processing apparatus.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key tree structure comprising a

plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes

of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a

plurality of paths whereby a given one of the paths extends from a specific

one of the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure,

a plurality of data processing apparatuses being respectively associated

with the leaves of the tree (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21),

Means for enciphering leaf-keys associated with the leaves using a

storage key that is proper to an individual one of the data processing

apparatuses and then storing the enciphered leaf-key in a memory means

within the corresponding data processing apparatus (Column 3, line 48 to

Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hierarchical

key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording and reproducing apparatus

of Kamibayashi in order to make the system scalable to allow for the

addition and modification of many processing apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 7,

Kamibayashi does not disclose a key tree structure comprising a

plurality of keys respectively associated with various roots of the tree

structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and

having a plurality of paths that extend from the roots to the leaves of the

key tree structure, plurality of data processing apparatuses respectively

corresponding to the leaves of the tree and to leaf-keys that further correspond with the leaves, a device key block stored in a memory within the processing apparatus, the key block being an assemblage of ciphered keys comprising mutually different individually enciphered node keys of plural steps extending from the leaves of the tree structure up to upper-rank keys of the key tree structure.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key tree structure comprising a plurality of keys respectively associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a plurality of paths that extend from the roots to the leaves of the key tree structure, plurality of data processing apparatuses respectively corresponding to the leaves of the tree and to leaf-keys that further correspond with the leaves (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21),

A device key block stored in a memory within the processing apparatus, the key block being an assemblage of ciphered keys comprising mutually different individually enciphered node keys of plural steps extending from the leaves of the tree structure up to upper-rank keys of the key tree structure (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hierarchical key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording and reproducing apparatus of Kamibayashi in

order to make the system scalable to allow for the addition and

modification of many processing apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 19,

Clam 19 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

5.   Claims 4, 11, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kamibayashi in view of Dondeti, further in view of Harada (U.S.

Patent 6,850,914).

Regarding Claim 4,

Kamibayashi as modified by Dondeti discloses the apparatus of

claim 3, in addition, Dondeti discloses that only a proper data processing

apparatus is enabled to decode the enabling key block, whereas an

improper apparatus is unable to decode the enabling key block (Column 3,

line 48 to Column 4, line 21); and Kamibayashi discloses determining

whether a data processing apparatus is proper, and if the data processing

apparatus is improper, preventing it from illegally implementing mutual

authentication with the virtual memory device (Column 12, line 22 to

Column 13, line 16); but does not disclose the use of licensing to

determine such.

Harada, however, discloses the use of licenses to determine which

data processing apparatuses are proper and which are not and revoking

an improper data processing apparatus (Column 5, lines 15-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the licensing and revocation system of Harada into the recording and reproducing apparatus of Kamibayashi as modified by Dondeti in order to provide for dynamic revocation of data processing apparatuses, such that revocation lists can be updated in a timely and efficient manner, thus allowing all proper apparatuses to know which other apparatuses are proper and which are revoked.

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 11,

Claim 11 is a system claim that is broader than apparatus claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is a system claim that is broader than system claim 11 and is rejected for the same reasons.

6.   Claims 2, 9, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Ansell (U.S. Patent 6,367,019).

Regarding Claim 2,

Ueda does not disclose initially checking whether the memory device includes the structure operable to execute the mutual authentication.

Ansell, however, discloses initially checking whether the memory device includes the structure operable to execute the mutual authentication (Column 12, lines 30-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the copy security system of Ansell into the recording and reproducing system of Ueda in order to allow copyrightable content of digital storage media to be protected against unauthorized copying, whether the storage media is functional or non-functional.

Regarding Claim 9,

Claim 9 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 21,

Claim 21 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

7.   Claims 3, 5-7, 10, 15, 17-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Dondeti.

Regarding Claim 3,

Ueda discloses that the mutual authentication between the

structure of the data processing apparatus and the virtual memory device

is executed by applying a distributed key and another authenticating key

previously stored in the virtual memory device (Figures 14-15; Column 23,

line 26 to Column 24, line 17; and Column 37, line 5 to Column 38, line

51);

But does not disclose authenticating distribution of an enabling key

block, the key having been previously enciphered by the enabling key

block, the enabling key block containing enciphering data for enciphering

renewal keys which are located on various paths of a hierarchical key tree

structure, the hierarchical tree structure having a plurality of keys

associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree

structure, and leaves of the tree structure, whereby a given one of the

plurality of paths of the key structure extends from a specific one of the

roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, the leaves

of the tree structure being respectively associated with a plurality of data

processing apparatuses, the enciphering data including upper-rank keys in

the tree hierarchy which are enciphered by lower-rank keys.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key for authenticating distribution of an enabling key block, the key having been previously enciphered by the enabling key block, the enabling key block containing enciphering data for enciphering renewal keys which are located on various paths of a hierarchical key tree structure, the hierarchical tree structure having a plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, whereby a given one of the plurality of paths of the key structure extends from a specific one of the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, the leaves of the tree structure being respectively associated with a plurality of data processing apparatuses, the enciphering data including upper-rank keys in the tree hierarchy which are enciphered by lower-rank keys (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hierarchical key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording and reproducing system of Ueda in order to make the system scalable to allow for the addition and modification of many processing apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 10,

Claim 10 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is a method claim that is broader than apparatus claim 3

and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Ueda as modified by Dondeti discloses the apparatus of claim 3, in

addition, Dondeti discloses means for subjecting the enabling key block

distribution authenticating key to a version controlling process by a

process for renewing individual versions (Column 1, lines 30-46; and

Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21).

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim

5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Ueda does not disclose a key tree structure comprising a plurality

of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the

tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a plurality of

paths whereby a given one of the paths extends from a specific one of the

roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, a plurality

of data processing apparatuses being respectively associated with the

leaves of the tree, means for enciphering leaf-keys associated with the

leaves using a storage key that is proper to an individual one of the data processing apparatuses and then storing the enciphered leaf-key in a memory means within the corresponding data processing apparatus.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key tree structure comprising a plurality of keys associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a plurality of paths whereby a given one of the paths extends from a specific one of the roots to a particular one of the leaves of the key tree structure, a plurality of data processing apparatuses being respectively associated with the leaves of the tree (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21),

Means for enciphering leaf-keys associated with the leaves using a storage key that is proper to an individual one of the data processing apparatuses and then storing the enciphered leaf-key in a memory means within the corresponding data processing apparatus (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hierarchical key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording and reproducing system of Ueda in order to make the system scalable to allow for the addition and modification of many processing apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 7,

Ueda does not disclose a key tree structure comprising a plurality of keys respectively associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a plurality of paths that extend from the roots to the leaves of the key tree structure, plurality of data processing apparatuses respectively corresponding to the leaves of the tree and to leaf-keys that further correspond with the leaves, a device key block stored in a memory within the processing apparatus, the key block being an assemblage of ciphered keys comprising mutually different individually enciphered node keys of plural steps extending from the leaves of the tree structure up to upper-rank keys of the key tree structure.

Dondeti, however, discloses a key tree structure comprising a plurality of keys respectively associated with various roots of the tree structure, nodes of the tree structure, and leaves of the tree structure, and having a plurality of paths that extend from the roots to the leaves of the key tree structure, plurality of data processing apparatuses respectively corresponding to the leaves of the tree and to leaf-keys that further correspond with the leaves (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21),

A device key block stored in a memory within the processing apparatus, the key block being an assemblage of ciphered keys comprising mutually different individually enciphered node keys of plural

steps extending from the leaves of the tree structure up to upper-rank keys of the key tree structure (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hierarchical key tree structure of Dondeti into the recording and reproducing system of Ueda in order to make the system scalable to allow for the addition and modification of many processing apparatuses.

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

8.   Claims 4, 11, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Dondeti, further in view of Harada.

Regarding Claim 4,

Ueda as modified by Dondeti discloses the apparatus of claim 3, in addition, Dondeti discloses that only a proper data processing apparatus is enabled to decode the enabling key block, whereas an improper apparatus is unable to decode the enabling key block (Column 3, line 48 to Column 4, line 21); but does not disclose the use of licensing to determine which data processing apparatuses are proper and which are not, or revoking improper data processing apparatuses.

Harada, however, discloses the use of licenses to determine which data processing apparatuses are proper and which are not and revoking an improper data processing apparatus (Column 5, lines 15-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the licensing and revocation system of Harada into the recording and reproducing system of Ueda as modified by Dondeti in order to provide for dynamic revocation of data processing apparatuses, such that revocation lists can be updated in a timely and efficient manner, thus allowing all proper apparatuses to know which other apparatuses are proper and which are revoked.

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is an apparatus claim that is broader than apparatus claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 11,

Claim 11 is a system claim that is broader than apparatus claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is a system claim that is broader than system claim 11 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER